



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/713,303

11/17/2003

Dominic Hugo Symes

550-483

1092

23117 7590 03/26/2007
NIXON & VANDERHYE, PC
901 NORTH GLEBE ROAD, 11TH FLOOR
ARLINGTON, VA 22203

EXAMINER

CHAI, LONGBIT

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2131

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
--	-----------	---------------

3 MONTHS

03/26/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/713,303	SYMES, DOMINIC HUGO	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Longbit Chai	2131	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 January 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 3/31/2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>1/16/2007</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Priority

1. Applicant's claim for benefit of foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. 119 (a) – (d) is acknowledged.

The application is filed on 11/17/2003 but has a foreign priority application filed on 11/18/2002.

Claim Objection

2. Claims 1, 15 and 29 are objected because the claim language “ensuring that operation of the processor” (on the very last claim limitation) should be “ensuring an operation of the processor”. Appropriate corrections are required.
3. Claim 30 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

4. Claims 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter where “a computer program” as recited in the claim does not fall into any category of statutory classes defined in 35 U.S.C 101. The

Art Unit: 2131

claim is merely directed to software per se and is not technologically embodied in a tangible medium. It is suggested by the Examiner to incorporate the limitations by being embodied on a computer readable storage medium. By not limiting the computer program product to being stored on a computer readable storage medium, there is a lack of the required functional and structural interrelationship between the software and the computer storage medium that permits the functionality of the software to be realized upon access by a processor. This ability is what underlies the ability to provide a practical application. Warmerdam, 33 F.3d at 1361, 31 USPQ2d at 1760. In re Sarkar, 588 F.2d 1330, 1333, 200 USPQ 132, 137 (CCPA 1978). See MPEP § 2106 (IV.B).1(a).

The dependent claim 30 is rejected to as having the same deficiencies as the claim 29 it depends from.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1 – 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Candelore et al. (WO 01/46800), in view of Shipman et al. (U.S. Patent 5,724,027).

As per claim 1, 15 and 29, Candelore teaches a data processing apparatus, comprising:

a processor operable in a plurality of modes and a plurality of domains, said plurality of domains comprising a secure domain and a non-secure domain, said plurality of modes including at least one non-secure mode being a mode in the non-secure domain, at least one secure mode being a mode in the secure domain (Candelore: Figure 1, Page 5 Line 13 – 19 and Page 8 Line 7 – 24: including a secure system portion and a non-secure system portion), and a monitor mode (Candelore: Page 13 Line 26 – 29: the switching mode between the secure mode and non-secure mode is considered as a monitor mode) , said processor being operable such that when executing a program in a secure mode said program has access to secure data which is not accessible when said processor is operating in a non-secure mode (Candelore: Page 8 Line 7 – 24: not even a single bit of the secure domain is passed / leaked to the non-secure domain);

a storage unit operable to store processor configuration data (Candelore: Page 16 Line 6 – 1, Page 11 Line 16 – 18 and Page 10 Line 21 – 24: for examples – (a) the MSB-bit of the address register is used as the memory space configuration data to manage the upper / lower memory bank for set of secure or non-secure program domains, or (b) a mode selection signal is used by the mode A / B timer switcher).

Candelore teaches said switching including switching the processor configuration data in the storage unit between secure processor configuration data and non-secure processor configuration data (Candelore: Page 16 Line 6 – 11: for examples

Art Unit: 2131

– the MSB-bit of the address register is used as the upper / lower memory bank for set of secure or non-secure programs). However, Candelore does not disclose expressly said processor being operable at least partially in said monitor mode to execute a monitor program to manage switching between said secure domain and said non-secure domain.

Shipman teaches said processor being operable at least partially in said monitor mode to execute a monitor program to manage switching between said secure domain and said non-secure domain (Shipman: Figure 4 / Element 106, 104 & 102, Column 2 Line 10 – 28, Column 4 Line 42 – 46: three modes are involved – a secure mode, a normal mode is as non-secure mode and a sleuth mode is qualified as a monitor / tracking mode, where the sleuth mode is directed exclusively by a SMI (System Management Interrupt) to perform the requested switching and mapping accordingly. Therefore, Examiner notes a SMI interrupt handler associated with the sleuth / monitor mode is indeed operable at least partially within the processor to execute a monitor program (i.e. SMI interrupt handler) to manage switching between said secure domain and said non-secure domain).

Accordingly (repeated herein), Candelore in view of Shipman teaches said processor being operable at least partially in said monitor mode to execute a monitor program to manage switching between said secure domain and said non-secure domain, said switching including switching the processor configuration data in the storage unit between secure processor configuration data and non-secure processor configuration data (repeated herein – See the rationale as set forth above);

when in said monitor mode, said monitor program being operable to use monitor mode specific processor configuration data, thereby ensuring that operation of the processor in said monitor mode is unaffected by the switching of the processor configuration data (Shipman: Column 4 Line 61 – 63, Column 5 Line 52 – 65 and Column 8 Line 64 – 67 & Figure 4: the sleuth mode monitor program works transparently to either a secure or non-secure operating system and is merely directed by the SMI handler – for example, even though the system initially operates in normal mode (i.e. non-secured mode), the SMI handler validates the password (i.e. a secured data) in the monitor mode and determines whether switching to the secured mode or back to the normal mode and as such is not controlled (i.e. unaffected) by the switching of the processor configuration data either way. Therefore, Examiner notes a portion of the monitor mode specific processor configuration data is interpreted as memory permission data that indicates that the processor is allowed to access said secure data (e.g. password – secured identity data) in said monitor mode that is also consistent with the disclosure of the specification of the instant application).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Shipman within the system of Candelore because (a) Candelore teaches a dual-mode processing allowing a secure and non-secure program domain to be managed within a single processor (Candelore: Page 17 Line 24 – 27 and Column 12 Line 23 – 26) and (b) Shipman teaches providing a more flexible and cost effective mechanism to an enhanced dual-mode processing by using a SMI (System Management Interrupt) directed monitor-mode to make the

Art Unit: 2131

appropriate security switching so that by virtue of the extendibility of the SMI handler, the system security functions may be easily extended and allowing minimal functionality to be required of the system and thereby reducing the cost of the system facility (Shipman: Column 2 Line 38 – 45 / 23 – 28).

As per claim 2 and 16, Candelore as modified teaches said processor configuration data is operable to control access to memory by the processor (Candelore: Page 16 Line 6 – 11 and Page 13 Line 26 – Page 14 Line 30: for examples – (a) the MSB-bit of the address register is used as one of the processor configuration data to manage the upper / lower memory bank for set of secure or non-secure programs, or (b) a mode selection signal is used by the mode A / B timer switcher and the options of timing data is used as one of the processor configuration data to manage the switching between the secure and non-secure program domains).

As per claim 3 and 17, Candelore as modified teaches the memory is operable to store data required by the processor and comprises secure memory for storing the secure data and non-secure memory for storing non-secure data (Candelore: Page 8 Line 15 – 24), said processor configuration data comprising memory permission data identifying whether the processor is allowed to access said secure data (Candelore: Page 13 Line 12 – 16 and Page 11 Line 11 – 15: the access control registers are used to allow the access to various memory blocks (either secure or nonsecure)).

As per claim 4 and 18, Candelore as modified teaches said processor configuration data comprises memory space configuration data identifying which areas of memory are accessible by the processor (Candelore: Page 16 Line 6 – 11, Page 11 Line 19 – 22 and Page 10 Line 21 – 24: for examples – the MSB-bit of the address register is used as the memory space configuration data to manage the upper / lower memory bank for set of secure or non-secure program domains).

As per claim 5 and 19, Candelore as modified teaches said memory includes a tightly coupled memory, and said memory space configuration data includes data for controlling the processor's access to said tightly coupled memory (Candelore: Page 16 Line 1 – 11 and Page 10 Line 21 – 24: cache memory is considered as one type of tightly coupled memories).

As per claim 6 and 20, Candelore as modified teaches said memory includes a cache, and said memory space configuration data includes data for controlling the processor's access to said cache (Candelore: Figure 3 / Element 170 & 190, Page 16 Line 1 – 11 and Page 10 Line 21 – 24: the MSB-bit of the cache address register is used as the memory space configuration data to manage the upper / lower bank A / B of cache memory for set of secure or non-secure program domains).

As per claim 7 and 21, Candelore as modified teaches said storage unit comprises one or more system configuration registers (Candelore: Figure 3 and Page 16 Line 6 – 11).

As per claim 8 and 22, Candelore as modified teaches said monitor mode specific processor configuration data is hard-coded (Candelore: Page 15 Line 13 – 16, Page 11 Line 16 – 18 and Page 14 Line 1 – 12: a mode selection signal is used by the mode A / B timer switcher and the timing requirement (i.e. one of monitor mode specific processor configuration data) can be placed on the CPU – i.e. it is hard coded).

As per claim 9 and 23, Candelore as modified teaches selection logic operable to select between said processor configuration data stored in the storage unit and said monitor mode specific processor configuration data in dependence on a control signal identifying whether the processor is operating in said monitor mode (Candelore: Figure 4 and Page 13 Line 20 – 28: the mode selection signal is qualified as the control signal).

As per claim 10 and 24, Candelore as modified teaches in said at least one non-secure mode the processor is operable under the control of a non-secure operating system and in said at least one secure mode the processor is operable under the control of a secure operating system (Candelore: Page 9 Line 3 – 4 and Page 6 Line 1 – 2 and Figure 1 / Element 10 & 50: two separate O.S.).

As per claim 11 and 25, Candelore as modified teaches said monitor mode specific processor configuration data comprises memory permission data that indicates that the processor is allowed to access said secure data in said monitor mode (Shipman: Column 8 Line 62 – 67 & Candelore: Page 13 Line 12 – 16 and Page 11 Line 11 – 15: in sleuth / monitor mode, the SMI handler is allowed to access the password (i.e. the secure data – user authentication identity data) prior to switching to the non-secured or secure mode based on the result of the authentications. Therefore, Examiner notes a portion of the monitor mode specific processor configuration data is interpreted as memory permission data that indicates that the processor is allowed to access said secure data (e.g. password – secured identity data) in said monitor mode).

As per claim 12 and 26, Candelore as modified teaches a memory management unit operable, upon receipt of a memory access request from the processor, to perform one or more predetermined access control functions to control issuance of the memory access request to the memory (Candelore: Page 11 Line 3 – 15 and Page 13 Line 12 – 16: the secured memory access request is interpreted as the predetermined access control functions to control issuance of the memory access request to meet the claim language); said monitor mode specific processor configuration data indicating that said memory management unit is disabled in said monitor mode (Shipman: Column 8 Line 62 – 67: in sleuth / monitor mode, the SMI handler validates the presented password prior to switching to the secure mode and being allowed to access the primary portion of secured memory according to the result of the authentications and as such Examiner

notes the majority portion of secured memories are obviously disabled in said monitor mode and subsequently enabled only after the success of password validation that directs the processor switching to the secured operation mode, as taught by Shipman).

As per claim 13 and 27, Candelore as modified teaches said memory includes a cache (Candelore: Page 11 Line 3 – 15 and Page 13 Line 12 – 16: the secured cache is interpreted as the included cache memory to meet the claim language), and said monitor mode specific processor configuration data indicates that the processor is not allowed to use said cache to access data in said monitor mode (Shipman: Column 8 Line 62 – 67: in sleuth / monitor mode, the SMI handler validates the presented password prior to switching to the secure mode and being allowed to access the primary portion of secured memory according to the result of the authentications and as such Examiner notes the majority portion of secured cache memories are obviously disabled in said monitor mode and subsequently enabled only after the success of password validation that directs the processor switching to the secured operation mode, as taught by Shipman).

As per claim 14 and 28, Candelore as modified teaches at least a portion of said monitor mode specific processor configuration data is derived from the secure processor configuration data (Shipman: Column 8 Line 62 – 67 & Candelore: Page 13 Line 12 – 16 and Page 11 Line 11 – 15: in sleuth / monitor mode, the SMI handler is allowed to access the password (i.e. the secure data – user authentication identity data)

Art Unit: 2131

prior to switching to the non-secured or secure mode based on the result of the authentications and as such Examiner notes a portion of the monitor mode specific processor configuration data is interpreted as memory permission data that indicates that the processor is allowed to access said secure data (e.g. password – secured identity data) in said monitor mode, which is also derived from the secure processor configuration data).

As per claim 30, Candelore as modified teaches a computer program product carrying a computer program as claimed in claim 29 (Candelore: Page 8 Line 6 – 24).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Longbit Chai whose telephone number is 571-272-3788. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:00am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz R. Sheikh can be reached on 571-272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2131

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Longbit Chai, Ph.D.
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2131
3/20/2007